



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

viz., the absolution in the Morning Prayer—viz.: "Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live; and hath given power and commandment to His ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins; *He pardoneth and absolveth* all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel." The other form is in the communion service, viz.: "*Almighty God*, our heavenly Father, who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him have mercy upon you; *pardon and deliver you from all your sins*; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

These three forms must be considered together, in order to understand what power the prayer-book attributes to the minister. On comparing them, it is evident that the words "I absolve thee," in the service for the visitation of the sick, must be intended in a sense quite different from the sense in which the Church of Rome uses those words.

We turn now to Mr. Rourke to help us to explain the difference. Mr. Rourke says—"In the last quotation given above from the Book of Common Prayer, your minister does not say to the penitent, *may Almighty God forgive thee thy sins*." Now, we always wish to be courteous, but still we must speak necessary truth as courteously as we can, and we ask Mr. Rourke to take it so. We really must meet this statement of Mr. Rourke with a direct contradiction. In that very quotation which Mr. Rourke gives in his letter, the minister does say what Mr. Rourke says he does not say. If Mr. Rourke will use his own eyes in looking at his own quotation in his own letter above given, he will read this—"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences." It is not until after he has said this that he goes on to say—"And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee," &c. In which it is apparent that the minister's authority, whatever it be, is held to be subordinate to the trust and hope that Christ, in answer to prayer, has first forgiven; but the priests of the Church of Rome do not say first, "Our Lord Jesus Christ of His great mercy forgive thee." No; that would spoil their object: they go at once to "I absolve thee." That alone is essential, important, desirable, with them.

It is evident, therefore, that our Reformers, in retaining these words in one particular case, could not have intended more than to use the words in that sense which would alone be consistent with their other forms, and which is moreover the construction which was actually put upon this form at its first introduction.

What that construction was we take from John de Athon, one of the most learned of English canonists, who wrote in the reign of Edward I., about the year 1290, not very long, perhaps, after the introduction of "Ego absolvo te" into England; who gives this comment, "I absolve thee; that is to say, I declare thee, being penitent, absolved."—Constit. Othobon., p. 82.

But the best authority on the prayer-book has said that the meaning of the form as it stands in the prayer-book is still more limited; "the form of absolution, of which we are now discoursing, is only designed to remit to the penitent the censures that might be due from the Church to his sins" (Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer, c. xi., p. 456). This is a case in which the ministers of the Church have authority to say, "I forgive thee." Thus, when a member of the Church of Corinth had grievously and openly offended, St. Paul gave them this command, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person"—(1. Cor. v. 13.); and when the man repented, St. Paul wrote, "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for if I forgive anything, to whom I forgive it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ"—(2 Cor. ii. 10).

We think it right that the ministers of the Church in attending the sick should have power to absolve from such punishment as the Church has power to impose. This power was always given in the primitive Church. We wish the form were so altered as to make this plain; that is the only alteration we wish to see in our prayer-book.

We have another difference to point out, important to those who object to have these words addressed to them. The Church of Rome requires all her members to seek salvation through the words, "Ego absolvo te," spoken by a priest, and denies salvation (so far as she can) to those who refuse that absolution; but the Church of England requires no one to receive it. Therefore, those who scruple at having these words addressed to them may consistently continue to be members of the Church of England, but they cannot continue to be members of the Church of Rome.

Having disposed of a form of words, we now come to the substance of the thing. We do this upon Mr. Rourke's other quotation. He quotes the following passage from the exhortation in the communion service:—"And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion but with a full trust in God's mercy and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any

of you who, by this means, cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice," &c. Now, if Mr. Rourke thought to embarrass us by this quotation, we must tell him that he is widely mistaken. We believe, without doubting, that it is the ordinary method of God's dealing in His Church, to give His people comfort, and peace, and absolution, and the assurance of pardon, through the ministry of His holy word by His ministers; and we think that God's ministers do rightly execute their commission in inviting those who are troubled in mind to come to them for this ministry. St. Paul thus described his ministry: God "hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."—(2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20).

That "ministry of reconciliation" we believe does still continue in the Church of God.

St. Peter, too, has taught us how this ministry should be exercised, when he said to Simon Magus, "Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee."—Acts viii. 22.

This, and this only, is the ministry intended or permitted in the exhortation in the communion service. We request Mr. Rourke to mark, that it is not lawful in the Church of England and Ireland for the ministers to use the words "I absolve thee" to those whom he has thus invited, but only that form of absolution which is in the communion service, and which we have given above.

Maintaining as we do that the Church of Rome is not infallible, but rather involved in many errors, and believing as we do that the Church of England and Ireland holds the truth, we can afford to admit that she has in one instance retained words not the best suited to express her doctrine.

We beg now to ask Mr. Rourke whether he thinks that we have succeeded in proving that the words "I absolve thee" were never used in the Church of Rome herself for twelve hundred years.

#### THE UNWILLING LISTENER—A PRIEST DEAF AND DUMB.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Travelling lately in this country on a deputation for the Bible Society, I met with a strange proof of the unwillingness of the priests to enter into controversy, even when the inducements to do so were of the strongest kind. I was seated on the outside of a coach, a priest occupying the box seat, his breviary by his side; behind him were three persons, one of them a Protestant, I rather think; the second a Roman Catholic, intelligent, and good humoured; the third myself.

After a little skirmishing on my part to draw on the subject of controversy, the Roman Catholic beside me opened a discussion of his own accord, by saying that it was a strange thing there should be so many differences amongst those who read the Bible, various and contradictory interpretations, sects and schisms, &c. I answered that it was undoubtedly a great evil, but that we should charge it not on God's Word, or on the humble and prayerful study of it, but on the wicked heart of man, who twisted and perverted its meaning to serve his own base purposes, and then turning a favourite text of the Roman Catholics against themselves, I added, the Bible itself declares this, for it says that the unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction; and this, I said, is a reason, not for keeping the Bible from the people, which is impossible, for get it they will, in some way or other; but it is a reason why the people should be instructed and enlightened, that they may not wrest it to their own destruction. All this time the priest said not a word. My opponent (a friendly and good-tempered one, I must say), finding I was prepared to meet him on this ground, changed his plan of attack. I suppose, said he, you will admit this age to be a highly enlightened and civilised one? is it not, then, strange that in the midst of all this knowledge and freedom men should be split up into so many sects and churches, when, for the first 1500 years after Christ, all were agreed to hold the same faith? Without entering on a wide field of ecclesiastical history, and telling him of the countless divisions, heresies, &c., that rent the Church of Rome herself during these boasted ages of faith and unity, I took up a simple line of defence. After making a few remarks on the Church of the Waldenses, who never were in communion with Rome, I said, two pastors of this Church lately visited Dublin, and at a meeting where they were present, the Archbishop of Dublin, who was in the chair, stated the great interest he felt in the Waldenses, from the fact that they had never, properly speaking, reformed—never assumed the name of Protestant; but dwelt in their native valleys, holding all through the same faith and doctrines. Here, then, I said, is an instance of some who did not submit to the Church of Rome,

even during the first 1500 years of which you speak. He could not deny this, but objected that those who held out against her were very few. Yes, I answered, but the Bible tells us that the Lord's flock is a little one, and that in every age those who profess a pure faith and are indeed His people are few and scattered. Finding this ground also untenable, and doubtless annoyed that the priest of his own Church in the front did not take up the cause, as a last resort he launched into a tirade of indiscriminate abuse on the missionary work in Ireland, charging those engaged in it with distributing bribes, soup tickets, &c., and that when everything else failed the poor people were persecuted. This was too much for my gravity, and, laughing outright, I asked him whether he had read the account of the Coombe riots and of the treatment Mr. Halahan had received; for if he had he would see where the charge of persecution really lay. The foregoing conversation and much to the same effect passed within earshot of a priest, who never once opened his lips during the entire time. I leave you, Mr. Editor, and your readers to form your own opinion about this strange circumstance; but I only ask, what would be thought of one of us if we were to allow a layman in our presence to defend our Church against a Romish priest, and never once render him the slightest assistance?

I remain, sir, yours, very truly,

M. A.

#### CAN A ROMAN CATHOLIC PRODUCE HIS RULE OF FAITH?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—When next the Reader met Andy, he says to him, "It's my turn now to attack the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith." "When I'm done," says Andy, "then you may." "But," says the Reader, "I'm afraid I'd have a long wait if I waited until then; for it seems as if you'll never be done." "Troth," says Jerry, "it's like the bargain the old master made with my grandfather long ago. 'Tim,' says he, 'I'm going to make you my own body servant, and you'll have the height of good wages, and eating and drinking galore; but it's on condition that you keep yourself sober; for,' says he, 'you'll have to bring me home every night after dinner, and 'twouldn't be decent for us both to be drunk together.' 'But, your honour,' say my grandfather, 'won't I get a turn at all?' 'I'll make a bargain with you,' says the master; 'you may take your turn every night that I'm sober.' So they went on very well for a while; but at last my grandfather came to him, and says he, 'I must be leaving your honour.' 'What fault do you find?' says the master. 'Isnt your wages pleasing to you?' 'It is,' says he. 'Have you any complaint to make about your living?' 'No,' says he, 'for we're fed like fighting cocks; but it's in regard of the bargain your honour made with me.' 'And wasn't it a fair bargain?' says the master. 'Faix it was,' says he; 'paring that your honour isn't ere a night sober, so that my turn never comes at all.' 'I'm afraid,' says the Reader, 'that would be the way with me if I had to wait until Andy finished, for it's himself that has the gift of the gab.' 'Well,' says the boys, 'let the Reader have a turn now. Fair play, and old Ireland for ever.' 'Well,' says he, 'tell me before I begin, isn't the point of dispute between us, which the Protestant or Roman Catholic Rule of Faith is best?' 'That's the very point,' says Andy. 'Well,' says the Reader, 'don't you think 'twould be a good way to produce the two rules, and let us examine them both together?' 'That's fair enough,' says the boys. [But I must tell your honour, as a secret, that Andy looked very down in the mouth when he heard it.] 'Now, boys,' says the Reader, 'here's my rule at all events; and with that he put down his BIBLE upon the table, and says he, 'Now put down the Roman Catholic Rule alongside it.' 'Sure,' says Andy, 'I proved that your rule is a bad and dangerous one.' 'Bad or good,' says the Reader, 'there it is; but *where's yours*?' 'Sure,' says Andy, 'I proved that *your* rule was so obscure that no one could understand it.' 'Obscure or not,' says the Reader, 'there it lies; but *where's yours*?' 'But,' says Andy, 'your rule doesn't contain all that's necessary for salvation.' 'And how do I know that yours is any better?' says the Reader, 'when you won't produce it. Wouldn't it be a hard case,' says he, 'to tell a poor man to throw away his old coat unless you gave him another? and isn't it hard to expect me to throw away my Rule of Faith until you give me a better?' 'But,' says Andy, 'before the time of Moses the Bible wasn't the rule, seeing that 'twasn't written.' 'But,' says the Reader, 'is that any reason that it shouldn't be the rule now that it is written? You might as well say that because people didn't travel by rail in Moses' time, we shouldn't do it now.' 'But,' says Andy, 'Adam and Eve didn't use the Bible as their rule.' 'But 'twasn't Adam and Eve's rule we want,' says the Reader, 'but *your* rule; and with that he turned to the boys, and says he, 'what use is it to tell us that you have a rule if you can't produce it? Tell me,' says he, 'what would you say if two men differed about which of their horses was the best, and one of them said, 'Bring out the two horses and let us try them both; but the other wouldn't produce his horse at all, though he held out stiffly that 'twas the best?' 'Troth,' says Jerry, 'I'd either think that he hadn't the horse at all, or that he thought him no great shakes.' 'Well,' says the Reader, 'that's

<sup>2</sup> This scene took place a few months since at a public discussion.

the way that 'tis between Andy and me. I say that my horse is the best, he says that his is best; 'Out with them both, then,' says I, 'and let the boys have a look at them.' 'But,' says he, 'your horse has the spavin.' 'No matter,' says I, 'there he stands, and now out with yours.' 'Sure,' says he, 'your horse is lame of a leg.' 'Lame or not,' says I, 'there he's ready for the trial, but where's yours?' 'Sure,' says he, 'your horse is blind of an eye.' 'And how do we know,' says I, 'but yours is blind of both eyes, when you won't produce him.' 'Sure,' says he, 'twasn't that kind of horse Moses rode.' 'No matter about Moses' horse,' says I, 'but where's your horse?' 'Sure,' says he, 'Adam and Eve hadn't a horse at all.' 'And what's that to us?' says I, 'we've horses, and we want to decide which is best.' Boys,' says he (holding up the Bible), 'there's the Protestant horse, but where's the Roman Catholic horse?' So with that the boys were down on Andy at once, and says one, 'You deluding villian, where's our Rule of Faith?' And says another, 'What makes you be shaking like a dog in a wet sack?' And says a third, 'Hand out our Rule of Faith, or by this and by that we'll hand you out in less than no time.' So Andy saw that the boys were in earnest, and that 'twas all up with him if he didn't produce the Rule of Faith, so he pulls out the Douay Bible and puts it down beside the Protestant Bible, and says he, 'There's our Rule of Faith.' 'Tisn't,' says the Reader, 'nor half of it.' 'It is,' says Andy. 'No,' says the Reader, 'and I'll prove that it isn't. Tell me, boys,' says he, 'did Dr. Milner know what the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith was?' 'Of course he did,' says they. 'Well,' says the Reader, 'here's what he says about it: 'We Catholics hold that the word of God in general, both written and unwritten; in other words, the BIBLE and TRADITION taken together, constitute the Rule of Faith.' Now,' says the Reader, 'put down your Traditions along with your Bible, and then I'll allow that you've produced your Rule of Faith.' So the boys began to get impatient, and one of them says to Andy, 'What's come over you at all? Why don't you put down the traditions at once? Are you going to let us be beaten by the Protestants?' But the Reader says to him, 'Tell us now honestly before the meeting, have you the other part of your rule?' 'No,' says he. 'How could I have it when it's in the decrees of councils, and in Greek and Latin books, and more of it somewhere or other in the Church; but we don't exactly know where.' 'You admit, then,' says the Reader, 'that you haven't the second part of your rule.' 'I do,' says Andy. 'Did you ever see the whole of your rule?' says the Reader. 'I allow that I didn't,' says Andy. 'Do you think the priest has it?' says the Reader. 'I don't think he has,' says Andy. 'Do you think the bishop has it?' says the Reader. 'Well, I'm in doubt that he hasn't,' says Andy. 'Well, boys,' says the Reader, 'isn't that a nice Rule of Faith that none of you ever saw, and that none of you ever will see. Give me the Rule of Faith that I can take and make use of, instead of the rule that you can talk about, but that you can never see or use.' 'Well,' says Andy, 'I must admit that I can't produce my rule, but, still, it may be better than yours, if it's the one God has given us; for maybe he didn't intend us to have it all.' 'Well,' says the Reader, 'we'll examine it in that way some other night; but I think it counts one to my side that you can't produce your rule. What would you say to a carpenter, if he told you that he had an elegant rule, but when you asked him to measure something for you, he said that he couldn't produce it, for 'twas in America?' 'Troth,' says Jerry, 'I'd say 'twasn't much use to him off there. Sure what he wanted was to have a hold of it, to make use of at the present time.' 'True for you,' says the Reader; 'and let your rule be ever such a fine one, I can't see what use it's to you, when you can't lay hold of it.' And with that he left us.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN CATHY.

#### QUESTIONS UPON THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—As you, with your highly-interesting and widely-circulated journal, are ever foremost in exposing ecclesiastical fallacies, solving religious difficulties, and defending scriptural truths, perhaps you would favour me by inserting the following queries, which I would propose to Mr. Power or some other of your Roman Catholic correspondents; and in doing so allow me to premise that I will confine myself for the present solely to the ecclesiastical history of Ireland. First, then, I would ask is it not an incontestable fact that for 700 years after the arrival of the Protestant apostle, St. Patrick, in Ireland, in 432, no pope ever nominated, confirmed, sanctioned, or appointed in any way, any one bishop, or archbishop, or other dignitary for any one see in Ireland, or gave a charter to any college, or school, or professor, or a licence or dispensation of any kind for Ireland, or heard one cause connected with the Church of this country, or had the least hand in the canonizing, or blessing, or appointing of any single one of the ancient saints of Ireland who lived before the 12th century, or was allowed in any other way to interfere with the concerns of the Church of this island until A.D. 1182? Is it not true that the first Irish

bishops who were subject in any way to any foreign power were the Danish bishops of the three cities of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, about the year 1074 and afterwards? Is it not consistent with Christian and historical verity to believe that the first pope who claimed supremacy or power over Ireland was Gregory VII., in 1084? That Gille, or Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, was the first pope's legate for Ireland, about the year 1106? That the first Irish council at which a pope's legate presided was that of Rathbreassil, in A.D. 1118? That the first Irish bishop whose appointment seems to be at all influenced by a pope of Rome, was one of Cork, about the year of our Lord 1140? That the first Irishmen who got the name of saints by the appointment of the Roman Catholic Church were Malachy O'Morgair, commonly called St. Malachy, who died A.D. 1148, and Laurence O'Toole, who died in 1180? That the first palls from Rome that were ever worn in Ireland were those given to the four Irish archbishops at the synod of Kells by Cardinal John Paparo, in 1152? That the first council in Ireland which ordered the practices of the Church here to be regulated in accordance with the system of the Church of Rome, as then used in England, was the synod of Cashel, in 1172? That the first primate of Armagh appointed by a pope was Eugene MacGillirder, in the year 1206. And, finally, is it not true that the learned Cardinal Baronius, in his famous ecclesiastical annals, says (of the early ages of Christianity) that at that time 'the bishops of Ireland were all schismatics separated from the community of the Church of Rome, and in close league with her enemies?' This admission from such an illustrious personage as the Cardinal is but one of the many passages which I might cite from *adverse* witnesses in proof of the already established fact, namely, that the ancient Irish Christian Church was entirely independent of Rome and the Pope, and that the Romish hierarchy now in Ireland are but intruders and usurpers. Let any Roman Catholic try to prove the succession of his present primate from St. Patrick. I confidently assert that no respectable writer of the Roman Catholic Church will even attempt this, for it is a well-known fact that the Church of Rome has no succession from St. Patrick. The Church of Ireland has, we can show, the succession of our present primate from St. Patrick, and, through him, from the bishops who were before him. 'For certain it is' (says O'Halloran, the Roman Catholic historian) *that St. Patrick found a hierarchy established in Ireland.* It is a well-known fact to every unprejudiced reader of history that in the second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth the 20 or 22 Romish bishops then ruling in Ireland became Protestants, all, with the exception of two; to wit, Walsh, Bishop of Meath, and Lercom, Bishop of Kildare. Now, all Roman Catholics must admit that those bishops were regularly consecrated bishops of the Irish Church, and had regular succession from the ancient Irish bishops in *Mary's reign*, and if they had regular succession in her reign, surely they must have had the same in Elizabeth's, and their regular successors, *our Bishops in the Irish Church*, have it from and through them. I have written this letter in the best spirit, earnestly hoping that it may in some degree induce some of your Roman Catholic readers to inquire more diligently and impartially into this very important subject. And so concluding, I remain, sir, yours, obediently,

J. O'B.

#### HOLY WELLS OF ARRAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—As you take so much interest in the subject of Holy Wells in Ireland, perhaps it may be interesting to you to know from an eye-witness that there are several such in the islands of Arran, which I had the pleasure of visiting last week with the Ethnological section of the British Association.

Unfortunately, however, I suppose in consequence of the approach of so many heretics, they were almost all dry, though the two principal of them—St. Eney's well, near *Teampull Benain*, the interesting church of St. Benignus, and that of St. Brechan, adjoining *Tempull Brechan*, the burial place of the patron saint of the island—were plentifully ornamented with rags and scraps of cloth, testifying the number of the devotees who frequent these holy fountains in less dry seasons. One of our scientific brethren, I am ashamed to confess, had so little respect for these votive offerings as ruthlessly to carry away a long sprig of a holy *bramble*, to which not less than six of them were attached. We trust, if St. Eney really minds such things, or requires such mementos of the piety of his votaries, that he will take special notice of the injury done to them by this unfeeling savant, whose only object appears to have been to carry away as a trophy a proof of the piety of the Arran islanders for the edification of his less informed countrymen.

I confess I was much more shocked at what was told me in the presence of Mr. O'Flaherty, the respected magistrate of the island, of the *aharla* or sacred enclosure adjoining St. Brechan's church, a place about ten feet square, surrounded with a low wall wholly uncovered—namely, that it is the common resort of pilgrims, male and female, on every Saturday night during the summer, who are frequently so numerous that they are obliged to sleep around as well as

in the sacred enclosure. This is for the cure of diseases, and supposed to be in females a remedy for barrenness.

Will you believe me when I add that this *aharla* is known by the name of the 'Holy Ghost's Bed,' and that it is not many years since the lady of a high sheriff of Galway is said to have resorted there for lack of children.

I have the honour to be yours,

A MEMBER OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION.

#### IMAGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Have any of your Roman Catholic readers ever read anything like the following passage in their Douay Bibles?—

'Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth.'

'Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands to them that love me, and keep my commandments.'—Exodus xx., 4, 5, and 6 vv.

Those who have read it surely must think the following announcement of Messrs. Barff and Co., of London, a somewhat striking commentary upon it. I extract it from the *Tablet* newspaper of 29th August last:—

#### RELIGIOUS STATUARY.

FOR CHRISTMAS.—*Figures for Bethlehem Crib.*—St. Joseph, 4 feet 6 inches high; kneeling figure of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and reclining figure of the Infant Saviour to match, all coloured like life, 15 guineas.

FOR LENT.—Set of Stations, quite new, alto relievo, painted like life, and set in decorated wood frames, £10.

Set of Coloured Stations, after the Frescoes in the Church of St. Louis, Munich, framed and glazed complete, 20 guineas.

Figure of dead Christ, 6 feet long, coloured after nature, in the new composition, 8 guineas.

Virgin and Child, life size, enriched with gold, 9 guineas.

Immaculate Conception, life size, enriched with gold, price 5 guineas.

Ditto (quite new model), nearly 4 feet high, enriched with gold, 3 guineas.

Ditto (Italian model), 2 feet 8½ inches high, enriched with gold, 30s.

Regina Cœli (enthroned), 2 feet 8 inches high, enriched with gold, with carved wood sceptre and nimbus of stars, £2 10s.

Madonna and Child, fitted up like the Regina Cœli, 3 feet 6 inches high, £2 10s.

St. Joseph, with carved wood lily, enriched with gold, 3 feet 9 inches high, £2 10s.

St. Aloysius, enriched with gold, carved wood lily in right hand and crucifix in left hand, 4 guineas.

St. Theresa, enriched with gold, from a Spanish carving, said to be a true likeness, 3 feet 4 inches high, £2 10s.

Pair of beautiful Adoring Angels (kneeling) 1 foot high, 30s. the pair—each 15s.

St. Joseph and Immaculate Conception, enriched with gold, each 2 feet 8½ inches high, price (each) 30s.

Arch-Confraternity Statue of Notre Dames des Victoires, four sizes.

Twelve Apostles, 2 feet 6 inches high.

In stock, brackets of various sizes to suit the statues.

A variety of new statues on hand.

N.B.—The figure of any Saint modelled, life size, in the new composition stone, coloured and gold, price 9 guineas.

Truly, it is thriving trade in England, this making of graven images, and brings, like the shrine-making of Diana at Ephesus, 'no small gain unto the craftsmen.'

Perhaps, sir, you might do well to suggest to the town-clerk of the modern Athens (vulgarily called Belfast) at the present crisis, the address by which his prototype in ancient Ephesus in his day appeased the multitudes, which I also extract verbatim from the Douay Bible (Acts xix. 35):—

'Ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great Diana, and of Jupiter's offspring.'

'Forasmuch, therefore, as these things cannot be gainsayed, you ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly.'

'For you have brought hither these men, who are neither guilty of sacrilege nor of blasphemy against your goddess.'

'But if Demetrius and the craftsmen that are with him have a matter against any man, the courts of justice are open, and there are pro-consuls. Let them accuse one another.'

I am, sir, yours,

A BELIEVER IN THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

#### FARMING OPERATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER.

*Transplanted Rape* should now be got in on the stubble lands without loss of time. A little manure will be well bestowed on this crop. The plants may be laid in in every third furrow as the ploughing proceeds, with a little manure put in on the root of each, the next furrow covers all up; or the land may be prepared as if for turnips, the manure deposited in the drills, covered up, and the plants dibbled in on the top of the drill.

*Rye* may be sown at one in the same manner as vetches, for either grain or a soiling crop. Twenty stone sows the Irish acre.